


Focused Intervention Programme - FIP

FIP was created to cope with the identified needs at the National Drug and Drug Addiction Plan – Horizonte 2012, European Drug Strategy 2005-2012 and the European Drug Action Plan 2005-2008. This programme, therefore, aims to promote ways of developing scientific, evidence-based projects in addiction prevention. These projects should meet the problems of specific groups by including in the selection, monitoring and evaluation process a rigorous and structured system of quality criteria.

The specific objectives of this programme are to develop selective preventive interventions for families, children and vulnerable youths, which promote, in these groups, specific skills to cope with risk associated with the use of psychoactive substances. It also aims to develop interventions for individuals who use psychoactive substances on recreational settings, which will delay and/or reduce the problematic use, abuse and problems associated with it.

Considering the literature reviewed and current prevention interventions used, projects developed within FIP should comply with the following criteria/principles:

- To **focus** on a specific group with risk factors linked to the use/abuse of licit and illicit psychoactive substances;
- To be **proactive** by creating conditions for the promotion of protection factors that allow populations to cope with risks of the use/abuse of licit and illicit psychoactive substances;
- To make sure that the **length and intensity are consistent** enough to ensure more effective and long lasting results;
- To be **comprehensive, this approach should acknowledge other domains** of the individual's life as school, family and community;
- To include a **methodological and conceptual** framework which will be the basis for the strategy, used to cope with the identified needs;
- To prioritise **strategies of selective intervention** which allow intervention and identification of vulnerable groups, independently of the individual risk;
- To use **multicomponent** and **innovative** approach in the design of the programme using different strategies and methodologies and also in the approach to target-groups (approach strategies should be adequate for the characteristics and risk level, trying to adapt answers to the specificities encountered);



- To be structured by the **Logic Model**, adopted by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, as a graphic representation of the project. It should describe its main elements and expected results, making clear the internal coherence of the project and the effectiveness of the results;
- To include the **evaluation** as a structuring principle in its different dimensions, namely, process and results;
- To include a **qualified technical team** of professionals who have specific training and experience in substance addiction prevention and health promotion;
- To guarantee **coherence** between the technical and financial dimensions of the project.

This programme has been set up through a call for tenders. The process of selection used the following criteria:

A- Building the project according to FIP principles

a.1 Focus in a specific group

Group(s) at risk can be defined by their strengths and vulnerabilities

Scale

0 - There is no risk or protection factors.

1 - There are risk or protection factors.

2 - There are risk or protection factors which correlate.

3 - There are risk and protection factors and their characteristics allow to understanding of the strengths and vulnerabilities of groups at risk.

The target-group is clearly identified for each action and accordingly to its characteristics

The target group is defined accordingly to its dimension.

The target group is defined accordingly to its composition.

The target group is defined accordingly to its characterisation (socio-demographic, individual characteristics, risk factors, etc.)


Scale

0 - No identification in any action of any indicator

1 - Most actions have defined the number of the target group individuals and/or the type of the characterisation

2 - Most actions show the three indicators.

3 - All actions have, clearly the three indicators which are adequate to the target group they belong to.



Dynamics between group/community:

Integration of group in the local community.

Perception of group towards the community.

Perception of the community towards the group.

Perception of the group towards itself.

Availability of the target group and of the community to participate in the project.

Data on other relevant variables.

Scale

0 - There is no data about the community where the group is located.

1 - There is a relationship between target group and community or vice-versa or perception of the group towards itself

2 - All data above is available.

3 - All data above is available plus the willingness of the group and the community to participate

a.2 Proactiveness

The target needs are explained by the hierarchisation/prioritization of identified problems

Scale

0 - There are no identified needs or they are not perceived as needs.

1 – The needs do not translate the problems.

2 – The needs translate the problems but are not realistic (not taking into consideration the resources).

3 – The needs translate the hierarchisation of the problems: they are realistic and they take into consideration the resources.

a.3 Comprehensiveness

The approach to the problem is comprehensive:

Scale

0 - The approach is not comprehensive – (Does not include other domains)

1 - The approach to other domains is only at awareness level/occasional interventions.


2 - The approach to other domains presumes an effective and consistent work (specific actions).

3 - The approach is comprehensive and the developed domains are relevant regarding the target needs.

a.4 Multicomponents and innovation

The selected models guide the intervention design:

Scale



- 0 - The components (dimensions worked with he target group, like skills development, knowledge of psychoactive substances, etc.) are not related to the theoretical model.
- 1 - At least one of the components is according to the theoretical model or is related to the target-needs.
- 2 - At least one of the components is according to the theoretical model and related to the target-needs.
- 3 - All components are justified by the theoretical model and the approach has different components.

a.5 Adapting approach strategies to the target group

The actions are suitable to the target group:

Scale

- 0 - None of the actions are suitable to the target group.
- 1 – Some actions are suitable in terms of their contents, duration and/or frequency.
- 2 - In most actions the contents, frequency and duration are suitable to the target-group.
- 3 - In all actions the contents, frequency, duration and development strategies are suitable to the target-group.

a.6 Evaluation as a structuring principle

Do the questions allow evaluation of the process? (i.e. Do they identify the dimensions that will be analysed?) [target category/group, implementation plan: content/actions, methodologies, time (intensity, duration and scheduling)]

Scale


- 0 – Questions are not elaborated or questions do not consider any of the indicators at the evaluation stage.
- 1 – Some of the questions consider indicators of process evaluation
- 2 –Most of the questions consider indicators at the process evaluation level.
- 3 – All questions consider consistently the indicators at the evaluation process level.

The methodology for collecting data from the evaluation process is adequate:

Scale

- Do most indicators provide qualitative data on what will be evaluated? Yes - 0.5
- Do most indicators provide quantitative data on what will be evaluated? Yes - 0.5
- Do most methods allow analysis of the selected indicators? Yes - 0.5
- Most of the selected instruments are specific and allow data collection? Yes - 0.5
- Most of data collection moments are adjusted to the required information? Yes - 0.5
- Most of the data collection sources are adjusted to the required information? Yes - 0.5

The questions of the evaluation plan allow to verify if the results respond to the objectives



Scale

- 0 – There is no question formulation or the formulated questions do not consider the evaluation of results.
- 1 – Some of the formulated questions allow evaluation of the results/changes in the target group.
- 2 – Most of the formulated questions allow evaluate the results/changes in the target group
- 3 – All of the formulated questions allow to evaluate consistently the results/changes in the target group

The methodology for collecting data from the results evaluation is suitable


Scale

- Do most indicators give qualitative data on what will be evaluated? Yes - 0.5
- Do most indicators give quantitative data on what will be evaluated? Yes - 0.5
- Do most methods allow analysis of the selected indicators? Yes - 0.5
- Most of the selected instruments are specific and allow data collection? Yes - 0.5
- Most of data collection moments are adjusted to the required information? Yes - 0.5
- Most of the data collection sources are adjusted to the required information Yes - 0.5

Publicising Results:

Scale

- 0 - No activities.
- 1 - Identification of activities.
- 2 - Identification of activities, and target groups but the justification is fairly consistent
- 3 - Identification of activities, target groups and the justification is entirely consistent



B- Relevance of the proposed intervention with regards to the objectives/results of FIP.

The goal identifies the expected changes of the intervention:

Scale

- 0 - The goal is not yet defined as a goal.
- 1 - The goal does not show the expected results or come from the long term expected results.
- 2 - The goal identifies the expected changes but is not realistic.
- 3 – The goal identifies the expected changes, it is realistic and comes from priority needs.

The General objectives contributes to the achievement of the programme objectives

Scale

- 0 - Most general objectives do not focus the dimensions.
- 1 - Most general objectives focus on at least one dimension.
- 2 - Most general objectives focus consistently on two dimensions.
- 3 – All objectives focus consistently on all dimensions.

C - The project is theory-based and has a methodological framework

The selected models allow the problem to be understood:

Scale


- 0 - Does not present a theoretical model.
- 1 -Presents a theoretical model.
- 2 - Presents and characterises the theoretical model but they are not related with target needs
- 3 - Models are identified, characterised and there is a relation between the theoretical model and the identified variables in target-needs.

The premises reflect the project theory.

Scale

- 0 – There are no defined premises or not defined as premises.
- 1 - Most premises are theory-based and/or on practical experience.
- 2 - Most premises are theory-based and on practical experience.
- 3 - All premises are theory-based and/or gained experience and explain how the project will get the expected results.

The external factors can influence (directly) the normal development of the project:



Scale

- 0 - There are no external factors or they are not defined as external factors.
- 1 - Most external factors are irrelevant.
- 2 - Most external factors are relevant.
- 3 - All external factors are relevant and realistic.

D - Coherence in between the internal structure of the project and the expected results effectiveness

The definition of the problem is clear and explicit and there is a correlation between the considered variables:

Scale

- 0 - There is no definition of the problem – too much information without any focus.
- 1 - The definition of the problem does not correlate with identified variables
- 2 - The definition of the problem correlate with some of the identified variables
- 3 - The definition of the problem is clear and explicit and there is a correlation between variables.

The present situation reflects a critical thought on the variables (PROBLEM, TARGET-GROUP, RESOURCES):

Scale

- 0 - There is no interpretation of the information, they do not identify the relevant aspects, it is not bounded and the current situation is not clear.
- 1 - There is an interpretation of information but they do not identify relevant aspects and the current situation is not bounded or clear.
- 2 - There is an interpretation of information that identifies relevant aspects, but the current situation is not bounded or clear.
- 3 - There is an interpretation of information, they identify the relevant aspects and the current situation is bounded and clear.

Taking into consideration priority needs, the results represent the expected changes in the short term:

Scale

- 0 - Most results do not represent any of the indicators or are not related to priority needs.
- 1 - Most results represent one of the indicators which may or may not be related to the priority needs.
- 2 - Most results represent one of the indicators and are related to the priority needs.
- 3 - All results represent all indicators and are related to the priority needs.

Taking into consideration priority needs, results represent expected changes in the medium term:

Scale

- 0 - Most of the results do not represent any of the indicators or are not related to the priority needs.
- 1 - Most results represent one of the indicators and may or may not be related to the priority needs.
- 2 - Most results represent one of the indicators and are related to the priority needs.
- 3 - All results represent all indicators and are related to the priority needs.

Taking into consideration priority needs, results represent expected changes in the long term:

Scale

- 0 - Most of the results do not represent any of the indicators or are not related to the priority needs.
- 1 - Most results represent one of the indicators and may or may not be related to the priority needs.
- 2 - Most results represent one of the indicators and are related to the priority needs.
- 3 - All results represent all indicators and are related to the priority needs.

Short, medium and long term results are dependent on each other:

Scale

- 0 - Results are not dependent on each other.
- 1 - There is some interdependence between results
- 2 - There is sustained interdependence between most of the results over time.
- 3 - There is sustained interdependence between all of the results over time.

General objectives are SMART:


Scale

- 0 - Most of the objectives do not show any of the indicators. show
- 1 - Most of the objectives show at least one of the indicators.
- 2 - Most of the objectives show two indicators with coherence.
- 3 - All objectives show all indicators with coherence.

Specific objectives are SMART:

Scale

- 0 - Most of the objectives do not show any of the indicators.



- 1 - Most of the objectives show at least one of the indicators.
- 2 - Most of the objectives show two indicators with coherence.
- 3 - All objectives show all indicators with coherence.

The design of the evaluation is coherent with the design of the project:

Scale

- 0 - There is no relation between the process plan, the results evaluation and the presented project.
- 1 – There is an evaluation design that allows process evaluation but does not allow the expected results to be evaluated, or the evaluation design allows expected results to be evaluated but does not allow process evaluation.
- 2 – There is a process evaluation and an evaluation of the results but with limited coherence.
- 3 – The process and results evaluation is coherent with the project and with the expected results.

The execution of actions allows the achievement of specific objectives (there is a clear connection between specific objectives and actions):

Scale

- 0 – Actions are not related to the objectives.
- 1 – Some actions allow the development of some objectives.
- 2 - Most actions permit the achievement of the objectives.
- 3 - In all actions the contents fulfil the objectives, methodologies allow the development of the contents and the length and frequency are adjusted.

The objectives and the expected results are dependent on each other:

Scale


- 0 - The objectives and expected results do not dependent on each other
- 1 - Most of the objectives and expected results do not dependent on each other or do it in an inconsistently way
- 2 - Most of the objectives are consistently dependent on the expected results
- 3 - All objectives are consistently dependent on expected results

E - Consistency of the project in relation to its length and intensity

Actions are clearly defined:

Scale

- 0 - Most of the actions are only defined as to their length and frequency.
- 1 - Most of the actions are defined as to their length, frequency and one other indicator.



- 2 - Most of the actions are defined as to their length, frequency and one other, consistent, indicator.
- 3 - All of the actions are defined as to all indicators consistently.

Adequate and relevant human resources for the actions:

Scale

- 0 - None of the professionals have the competence and/or the allocation of time is not adequate.
- 1 – Some of the professionals have the competence and/or adequate allocation of time
- 2 – Most professionals have the competence and allocation of time is adequate.
- 3 –All the professionals have the competence and the allocation of time is adequate

F - Coherence between technical and financial dimensions

Constitution of the technical team

Scale

- 0 - All professionals are to be selected/hired.
- 1 - At least 1/3 of the professional are selected/hired
- 2 - At least 2/3 of the professional are selected/hired.
- 3 - All professionals are selected/hired.

Academic background and professional experience of the team


Scale

- 0 - There is no professionals from the Social Sciences area, or the academic background of the professionals is not known and they do not have experience in Preventive Intervention.
- 1 - Some of the professionals have a Social Sciences background but do not have experience in Preventive Interventions or some of the professionals do not have an education in Social Sciences but do have experience in Preventive Interventions.
- 2 – The majority of the professionals have a Social Sciences background but do not have experience in Preventive Interventions or the majority of the professionals do not have a Social Sciences background but do have experience in Preventive Interventions.
- 3 - All the professionals have a Social Sciences background and have experience in Preventive Interventions.

How adequate and relevant are the other resources for the actions:

Scale

- 0 - None of the “other resources” are adequate and relevant to the actions.
- 1 – Some of the “other resources” are adequate and relevant to the actions.



2 – Most of the “other resources” are listed in a specific way and are adequate and relevant to the actions.

3 - All of the “other resources” are listed in a specific way and are adequate and relevant to the actions.

Importance of the requested financing in relation to the project:

Scale

0 – No calculations presented or the ones presented are not perceptible and/or do not comply with the law.

1 – Some calculations are perceptible and/or there exists some link with the implementation plan (technical actions and the professional team) and some comply with the law.

2 – Most calculations are perceptible and/or there exists some link with the implementation plan (technical actions and the professional team) and all comply with the law.

3 – All calculations are perceptible and/or there exists some link with the implementation plan (technical actions and the professional team) and all comply with the law.